

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,350	08/06/2003	Debra L. Koplish	DLK-101A	8897
75	90 01/20/2006		EXAMINER	
Kenneth P. Glynn, Esq.			WEINSTEIN, STEVEN L	
Glynn & Associ	ates, P.C.			
24 Mine Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Flemington, NJ	08822		1761	
			DATE MAILED: 01/20/2006	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

_				\sim			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	<u> </u>			
		10/635,350	KOPLISH, DEBRA L.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Steven L. Weinstein	1761				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communic or Reply	cation appears on the cover sheet v	ith the correspondence address				
WHIC - Exte after - If NO - Faill Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MA ensions of time may be available under the provisions of r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communal of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statu- ture to reply within the set or extended period for reply we reply received by the Office later than three months afted and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ALING DATE OF THIS COMMUN f 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a nication. utory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC rill, by statute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)[🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed	I on 03 November 2005.					
·		b) This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 21-40 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 21-40 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction	e withdrawn from consideration.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
• —	The specification is objected to by the						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	a) accepted or b) dobjected to	by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any object						
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including to The oath or declaration is objected to	·).			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority of Some * Copies of the priority of Some * Copies of the priority of See the attached detailed Office action	locuments have been received. locuments have been received in f the priority documents have bee al Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage				
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)				
3) Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or P er No(s)/Mail Date	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05) Application/Control Number: 10/635,350

Art Unit: 1761

Claims 21-27 and 35-40 are rejected under 35USC112, 1ST paragraph for containing New Matter. The phrase that the wrap is "fully wrapped" around the substantially vertical walls is considered to be New Matter. Nowhere in the specification is the "fully wrapped" concept disclosed.

Claims 21-40 are rejected under 35USC103(a) as being unpatentable over Good Housekeeping (1961), as evidenced by Step-by-Step (1994), Wilton (1994), Wilton (1996), Wilton (1997), and Birthday Cakes (1994), further in view of Disney (5/2/96) and Stewart et al ('897), further in view of Jamin ('423), all of whom are applied for the reasons fully and clearly detailed in the Office action mailed 5/26/05, and further in view of Walker (2,082,671), Stoner (1,348,761), Porter (1,382,383), Cassidy (1,623,165), Steiner (2,999,511), and Schiller (2,315,164).

As discussed in the last Office action, the art is replete with examples of edible (or inedible) substrates that are employed to decorate cakes and other foods and wherein the substrates can be material that is a film, which film would have the capability of wrapping, and wherein the substrates can be printed. Clams 21 and 35 now recite that the wrap is "fully wrapped" around the vertical walls. As discussed above, this recitation appears to be New Matter. In any case, as evidence by Walker, Stoner, Porter, Cassidy, Steiner, and Schiller, it is notoriously old in the art to print a distinguishing scene on a wrapper and wrap a food in the printed/decorated wrapper such that the scene is imparted to the wrapped food and, usually, in combination with other decorative elements, imparts to the food a three dimensional effect. To therefore modify the combination and fully wrap at least the vertical side walls with the

Application/Control Number: 10/635,350 Page 3

Art Unit: 1761

decorated/printed wrapping material would have been unequivocally obvious. Claim 28 is rejected for the reasons given above. Note, too, the art teaches both edible and inedible printed decorations and that the printed decorations can be peelable from a substrate. Finally, it is noted that claims 1, 28 and 35 employ the word "consists". As noted in the last Office action, all of applicants decorative expedients are conventional and to mix and match conventional decorative expedients is seen to have been nothing more than obvious matters of choice and/or design and an obvious matter of personal taste —an obvious exercise in conventional edible arts and crafts, if you will.

All of applicant's remarks filed 11/3/05 have been fully and carefully considered but are not found to be convincing. Whereas applicant concedes that it was known to provide three dimensional cakes, applicant apparently is urging that none of the references teach the edible base with the particular two dimensional decoration-i.e.an edible, printed substrate. This urging is totally unconvincing. Once it was known to provide decorative cakes with a base and an upper portion, wherein both portions are provided with decorations, the particular conventional decoration one chooses to use, for its art recognized and applicant's intended function, is seen to have been obvious. Not only is applicant not the inventor of printed, edible film material as evidenced, for example, by Stewart, applicant is also not the inventor of the concept of decorating a side of a food (including cakes) with the printed, edible film as evidenced by Stewart, nor is applicant the inventor of using printed, wrapping material to fully wrap a food to impart a recognizable design and decoration to the food.

Application/Control Number: 10/635,350

Art Unit: 1761

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven L. Weinstein whose telephone number is 571-272-1410. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00AM-2:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano, can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Application/Control Number: 10/635,350 Page 5

Art Unit: 1761

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

STEVE WEINSTEIN 1760 PRIMARY EXAMINER